

FACTS ABOUT EAST TENNESSEE.

Answer to Correspondents.
NO. XIX.

We had expected to give as our East Tennessee article for this number of our Weekly an article from a prominent geological gentleman now in our State, but through some misunderstanding it has not come to hand in time, and we had no notice of the failure until too late to prepare one. This is our excuse for not giving one in regular course.

Instead, we have a few letters to answer which we will do through our paper, as the answer may be of interest to others than those inquiring.

A correspondent writes us as follows:

BINGHAMTON, N.Y., May 4th, 1871.
Messrs. *Rule & Rich*:
GENTLEMEN—Myself and several of my friends have decided to leave this place to settle in some part South. Have not yet concluded where. Will you please inform me what is the current rate of wages paid to sawyers, carpenters and machinists in Knoxville or vicinity, and is such labor in demand. Also the rate of wages paid to men of no particular trade, who are willing to work at anything.
I enclose you twenty-five cents. Please send me a few copies of the Knoxville WEEKLY CHRONICLE and oblige.
Yours truly,
J. S. JONES, Box 1,351.

In reply we have to say that the wages paid to the class of mechanics referred to will average from one and a half to three dollars per day. Good carpenters can find employment, we should think, almost anywhere in East Tennessee. Just in Knoxville most of the trades are pretty well represented and labor is not lacking, but good workmen can most always find employment.

If any of Mr. Jones' friends are stone masons or stone cutters or practical builders, they can find employment here on the new Custom House and Post Office building now being built by the Government. This work will probably last a year, and steady employment for that time may reasonably be expected. Letters addressed to the superintendent, M. S. Wilds, will receive prompt answers and the exact status of the work, wages, &c., be soon ascertained.

Claiborne County Items.

TAKEWELL, TENN., May 3d, 1871.

MESSRS. EDITORS: The Circuit Court is now in session at this place. The Hon. James H. Randolph, presiding, and under his rapid manner of disposing of public business, quite a number of causes have tried, the most important of which are the following:

The State vs. Jas. Winkler, for murder of Heinz Russel, continued by the defendant.

The State vs. Jesse Shaufner, robbery. The jury made a mistrial.

The State vs. David Morgan, assault ten days imprisonment in county jail.

The State vs. John Thomas, col'd, larceny. Sentenced three years to the Penitentiary.

The State vs. Joseph Dudley, col'd, larceny. Verdict not yet rendered.

We have the most intelligent and active grand jury that has been selected for this county for years. They are hard at work and seem to be getting quite a number of indictments and presentments. They have for their foreman B. F. Cloud, Esq., and through his influence with the instructions of our most efficient Attorney General, J. A. Dewey, Esq., they cannot but help in carrying out and enforcing the laws of the State.

We had a colored jury for the first time to-day in the case of the State vs. John Thomas, whom they sentenced to the penitentiary for the term of three years. They conducted themselves fully as well as a white jury could have done, and gave satisfaction to every one who wants justice. They returned their verdict in a short time after the charge of His Honor, and did so in as satisfactory and in as technical style as any lawyer at the bar could have done.

Money matters are beginning to get better as the returns from sales for produce shipped to Chattanooga come in.
More hereafter. J. R. E.

THE WEATHER AND THE CROPS IN THE CENTRAL STATES.—Nature is now laying the foundations for trade next season. The country has not yet recovered from recent crop failures. The harvest of 1870 was a fair average, but it was not full, and the deficiencies resulting from previous failures were only partially made up. To put the country squarely upon its feet we need, at least, a full yield this year. For this farmers are now working hard, and the promise for handsome results is favorable. For fall wheat the weather has been about all that could be desired, and this crop never looked better than at this time. With propitious weather in May and June there will be an overflowing wheat harvest.

The Spring has been unusually favorable for field work. The weather in March and April was such that farmers were able to prepare the ground and get in potatoes and small grain, and now corn planting, which is often delayed until late in May, is nearly done. Corn was planted early last year, and this saved the crop, which was well forward before the drought set in. The progress this season is still better. Up to Monday the weather was very dry, and there was much complaint, but Tuesday a steady, warm, soaking rain fell, which made all things right, and this was followed yesterday by a warm sun, with occasional showers. This rain also stopped the croaking about the hay crop. And now it may be said that the foundations have been well laid for large crops, and everything in the farming line looks favorable. The prospects, indeed, could not be better.—*Chn. Gazette*, April 24.

HOW SHALL WE EDUCATE.

OUR CITY SCHOOLS.

"Fair Play."

MESSRS. EDITORS: Such is the signature of a correspondent of the *Press and Herald* on Thursday, who writes in the interests of the Roman Catholic Church. Used as the words are, they are calculated to make a wrong impression upon unreflecting minds, as though "One of Very Many," and they who sympathize with him, were disposed to deny to the Roman Catholics in this city, equal rights and privileges with other citizens, when in truth it is the Roman Catholic Priest and his friends who are not content to meet their fellow-citizens upon a common platform as regards free school education, and who demand special and exclusive rights and privileges. I, for one, am thankful to your correspondent, "One of Very Many," for having brought this subject to the attention of the public, and I am satisfied that the large majority of the community will be with me in this feeling. It was right that the people should know that the project of diverting a part of the common school funds from their proper and equitable use and applying it to the maintenance of a school under the control and direction of the Roman Catholic Priest was under consideration, that it had its friends in the Board of Aldermen, and that if not protested against and resisted, it might succeed. I am sure that it is because "One of Very Many" is an earnest and devoted friend of civil and religious liberty, that he has stepped forward, however reluctantly because of the disagreeableness of the task, objected to the demand of the Priest being granted and brought the whole matter into the light, where the people can see and decide upon its merits for themselves. Indeed, the question at issue especially deserves attention on account of its bearings upon civil and religious liberty, and I beg leave to commend it in that point of view to the thoughtful consideration of your readers. Now, let it be remembered that the Roman Catholic Priesthood and Church hold these tenets, viz: First, That the true religion is preserved and taught only in and by that church, and is to be found only within its fold.

Second, That the education of children and youth in day schools should be not only secular, but also positively religious. It follows, therefore, by an obvious deduction, that so far as the mind and will of that church are concerned, there should be, morally considered, no popular education which does not include religious instruction according to its own dogmas and creed. This conclusion would be comparatively unimportant and harmless, if the past history of that church and its spirit and temper at this day, as illustrated by its practice in countries where it dominates, did not show that it is intolerant and proscriptive; and that, when it has the power, it will carry out its exclusive tenets to their logical conclusions, however bitter and hurtful those conclusions may be to Christian people of other denominations. *There lies the rub.* We distrust Rome, and we have good reason to do so. In this country it is as yet as a young tiger, whose claws are scarcely formed beneath its velvet paws; but it is not wise to stand and admire and fondle it, without reflecting upon its essential nature and what it may do when it is grown. If it be asked why not distrust some one or other of the Protestant Christian churches in the same way, I reply, because, as a certain learned writer has said, "A sincere Roman Catholic may be conscientiously tolerant, but a consistent Roman Catholic never can be so." Yet, a Presbyterian or Methodist may be so. Intolerance is imbedded in the very heart of the Roman Catholic system. If it ever finds any place in the workings of Protestantism, it does so by intrusion, as a foreign and uncongenial element. Nor, in saying this, do we intend or convey any injurious reflections upon persons or of that church.

No one has any quarrel with its Priest or people. By no means. We would rather cultivate and maintain as kindly, neighborly relations with them as is possible. No doubt that Church contains many very good and worthy persons. Instances of marked personal piety have been found in its fold. Many of its people prove to be useful and praiseworthy citizens. But its ecclesiastical system is *oppressive, corrupt and destructive*. The policy it adopts and urges forward is dangerous both to the independence of the State and the freedom of the people. See how its intolerant temper and attitude work to the denial of the moral right of the State, city and county to educate their children, unless, indeed, they will give them religious instruction such as Rome approves! It is not the work of education itself which that Church objects to, nor is it the raising of taxes from the people for that purpose. As it has again and again used the secular power to carry out its plans, so we may be sure it would do in this case, if it had the power. It takes the ground that all education in this country should be religious, and as we know, it allows no true religion to exist outside of its own fold, the logical inference with it is that there should be no education of children except under the control and direction of the Roman Catholic Church. Shall we bear ourselves in this matter so as to admit that inference? Shall we allow an opening wedge under false pretences of "fair play" to a few religious sectarians to be thrust into the work of common school education by the city, the county and the State, when we may see at a glance that the real and ultimate purpose is to overthrow it, and upon the plea that all education should be religious, draw it into the hands of the Roman Catholic Priesthood as the representative of the only true religion? Every one who will perceive that the Roman Catholic Church is working might and main in this country to use politicians for its own ends, and to make secular power in States and cities subservient to its exclusive "demands" and to its desire to rule over this people; and unfortunately it is meeting with such success as emboldens it to persevere in its efforts. And the generation may not be very distant which will witness its employment of selfish political partisans in turning the stream of taxes levied from the people into the exclusive support of schools, the superior control of which shall be exercised, not by the civil authority, but by an ecclesiastical hierarchy, the head of which is the Pope, and in which not only secular instruction shall be given, but also "positive" religious instruction, and that after the manner of Rome. Let us then take heed! Once admit that the public school money may be used in part to maintain sectarian schools, under the conduct of the Roman Catholic Priests, upon the alleged plea, which is at the root of this interference, that the State has no moral right to give secular without positive religious Roman Catholic instruction to its children, and the principle upon which the common school system rests is abandoned, and the door opened to the use of the whole of the money in that way! RUSTICS.

"One of Very Many."

NUMBER IV.

MESSRS. EDITORS: Since Father Finnegan has retired from the field, it is a question how far I should pursue the subject, with the case altogether in my own hands. If it were not that some things he touches, in his closing letter, might leave a false impression upon the public mind, it would perhaps be best to rest the case with the simple, clearly cut issue which has been made. As it is, however, I must beg to submit certain statements.

1. THE FATHER'S GOOD TEMPER.

In his farewell letter this is quite unexceptionable, and in response to it I can more than pass over the hard language of his earlier pieces. I repeat, therefore, that personally I have nothing at all to bring against my courteous opponent, and will be always ready to testify to the ability which he has brought to the support of what I regard a bad cause and a dangerous principle, as well as to the general propriety with which he has borne himself. It is with Father Finnegan as the agent of an ecclesiastical organization which, through its hold on the balance of political power endangers all that is peculiar in the American type of civilization and liberty, that I have a contest.

2. THE QUESTION.

I am glad the Father keeps this before us. All else in this discussion is of little value but as it bears upon this momentous issue in itself, in its prospective reach and its necessary connections. Father Finnegan says: "I have from the beginning insisted on the right of a parent to educate his children in whatever manner he pleases." This is a sound position in the sense he intends, only it would be well for him not to forget that in the Papal States, where only his church was absolute and unquestioned master, the parent had not, until the Pope was dethroned, any such "right" conceded. How are we to hope for a continuance of the "right" of a parent in this important matter if his church should gain, as he claims it will at length, supreme control in this country? He boasts that his church has always been infallible, and, therefore, that it never changes its principles. Must they not, therefore, take away the right of a Protestant parent to educate his child in his own way, when they have the power to do so?

But the Father, in the same breath, asserts "the injustice of compelling any man to pay taxes for the support of a school from which he derives no material advantage." Now let us examine this position. It will not be denied that a grossly ignorant community will perform by a degraded, vicious, and criminal community. In such a community the conditions of prosperity do not exist. The few who are educated, thrifty and prosperous, will find themselves forced to pay high taxes to support paupers, and prisons and other institutions made necessary by crime and vice which are the children of ignorance. Will the Father claim that it is "gross injustice" to tax a man to support these institutions? Will he not confess that the very existence of Government demands such a tax? Well, which is fairer and better, to pay a tax to support the common school that prevents the growth of the criminal classes, or to pay the tax to restrain and blind and punish them? If it be said, sectarian schools will be sufficient to educate the masses, the answer is at hand. All history and current observation in our own land disproves the assertion. Wherever there is not a common school fund, education among the poorer classes languishes, is, in fact, almost wholly neglected.

The Father adds, "that many good and worthy men, even in Knoxville, will never consent to send their children to the common school," and asks if it is "not an outrage upon these to take their money" for support of such schools? By no means. I have heard one of this class say publicly that though he did not expect to receive any aid from the school in educating his own family, he was heartily in favor of paying his proportion of the tax. His reasons were that the "tax was right," and that it was the "cheapest way" to meet the expenses of Government.

As to the Father's remark about "taxation without representation," I must be allowed to suggest that he could not surely have made it seriously. "Taxation without representation" is a technical expression and refers to an arbitrary exclusion from the councils that dispose of common claims and interests. No such exclusion has ever been hinted or for a moment entertained. The proposition is to place all citizens on the same footing in this matter, and even in the appointment of teachers to appoint simply on their merits, to give Roman Catholic applicants an equal chance with others. Is not this fair?

3. THE AIMS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The Father asserts that they are simply "very anxious to perpetuate their religion by all honorable means" &c. No one objects to this. Ours is, or at least, it has heretofore been, a land of liberty which Protestant principles must secure, if their adherents are consistent. We leave it to countries where the Roman Church has

supreme sway to use other instruments than those of argument in opposing what is deemed religious error. What we do object to, and will oppose is, that an ecclesiastical system that has wielded the *Inquisition*, and boasts itself superior to change, a system opposed to all our cherished views of liberty, civilization and Christianity, shall come into our land and work by political influence to get control of our common funds whether for sectarian schools or charities. We object strongly to its claim of exemptions or of partitions that no other church thinks of asserting. We examine the structure of that system, and find it intrinsically and necessarily despotic. We trace its path through history, and find whatever good purposes it has served, infinite perversions of religion, iron-bound tyranny and relentless persecution. We inquire into its modes and plans in our own country and find them deeply laid, comprehensive and far reaching, embracing the unscrupulous employment of every political stratagem by which to work into control amid the controversies, and distractions of the times. We turn our eyes upon the accomplished agents of this organization, and are met by a trained band, working as one man to the one end of subduing the land to their church, and establishing here the institutions, that for centuries crushed freedom and the Bible in continental Europe, and are now rotting along with the life of the nations whose manhood they have emasculated. This is the scene that meets us, and we are determined "to give way by subjection, no, not for an hour." We are determined, if possible, to prevent the agents of this system from using political influence to get control of even a portion of our public funds. We will keep those funds intact for their purposes, for we well know where the entire animal will soon be, if we let the head in. If our Roman Catholic citizens will join us in the common school, we will freely allow them the influence which as individuals they may exert. But we cannot tamely suffer them to erect themselves into organized hostility to our system, and use the public funds to fight with.

4. THE QUESTION OF SECTARIAN BIAS.

Father Finnegan maintains that it is impossible for a common school to be non-sectarian. He thinks every teacher must have a "bias." I need not spend time on this assertion. Suppose he has a bias. It will come out in teaching spelling, reading, and arithmetic, in no very prominent way. Then, a little latitude in this matter, among the various teachers will only have the effect of whetting off some of the angles of denominational prejudice, and do no harm. Then again, there will be some Roman Catholic teachers in the schools, and they will manifest their "bias" in the direction of their own church. Where the system is such as to repress all proselyting in the offensive sense, no great influence need be feared. Teachers, will under the then existing circumstances, be careful to confine themselves to their own proper work, leaving to more competent hands the work of specific doctrinal Christian training.

5. STATISTICS AGAIN.

I should not have again touched this question, if the Father's statements had not compelled me. It is not a pleasant subject, for we must all feel profoundly humiliated, whether Protestants or Romanists, that the gospel in our hands has not been more faithfully and successfully applied to the salvation of the people, and thus to the prevention of crime. But it is not as the Father would have it, a mere question of "casting out the beam from our own eye." We are here on a question of great public concernment. The Father's claim for superior moral results from the teaching in the schools of his church, springing the question upon us. I have shown from tables taken from actual government statistics—not that the Roman Church fosters crime—but that it has less power to restrain it than the Protestant Church. This exhibit the Father meets by counter-statements. In some cases he gives the statements without mentioning any authority at all. In others he gives authorities of private character, such as the assertion of clergymen and physicians, loosely made, and therefore, in such a connection worth very little.

To show how much reliance is to be placed on these statements of the Father, take one or two cases. In one of his articles he gives a statement from an authority unknown to me, that during an entire year there was not a single conviction for murder in Ireland. How untrustworthy any such statement must be is evident to all who have seen the Irish people in great cities where they generally furnish more criminals than all the other classes of population combined. But take in this connection the figures in tables, laid before Parliament and published by the House in 1852. From these we learn that the total number of criminals for murder during the year 1851 in England

Was.....	74
Discharged—no evidence.....	8
Acquitted on trial.....	44
Convicted.....	16
Insane persons.....	6

The proportion of conviction for murder during that year in England and Wales was 4 to the million of population!

A return laid before the House of Commons, covering a period of less than three years in Ireland, shows the yearly average of 235—equal to 33 murders to the million. What is remarkable is that during a number of years subsequent to 1839, the time of this return, there were large numbers of conversions to the Protestant faith, and an extensive emigration, so that from the Parliamentary return in 1851 it appears that the number of murders to the million had sunk to 19! Such facts and figures tell their own tale.

Take another of the Father's implied assertions. It is that in Rhode Island more than 1 of the children that ought to be born of Protestant women, are destroyed in infanticide. For this statement he gives no authority whatever. Every one will see that the truth of this monstrous assertion is morally impossible. Every one knows that the poor Irish woman is almost

doubly prolific as compared with the better class of educated and prosperous Protestant women, and every one knows also that on account of the emigration of the young men of New England in large numbers there is a great disproportion in the numerical relation of the sexes, very many women never entering into the marriage state at all. But explanation is not needed. The assertion is so horrible that no sensible person will or can believe it, unless blinded by prejudice.

I might quote other tables of the same unquestionable (because government authority), equally significant with those I have given in the course of this discussion, but prefer to disband the subject.

In closing, I would but allude to two points. The reason of my not recurring to the question of the Father's allegiance to the Pope, is, that I was unwilling to quote from memory the case of recent date that I had in mind. I have written for the report, but it has not yet arrived. It is the case of a Roman Catholic Bishop in the North-west, who was recently forced to translate, in open court, and to acknowledge the present binding force of the laws of his church, not only demanding his allegiance to the Pope, but making it his duty to persecute Protestants. Let it go, however, as the discussion is closed.

Father Finnegan makes the assertion that he has been informed two or three Protestant churches were seen by a certain gentleman in Rome years ago. The notorious fact is, that the Presbyterians were forced to go out of the city proper to hold their worship at all, and the Episcopal service could only be held in the apartments of the American Minister, covered by the American flag. Even this privilege was hemmed in by the closest restrictions.

The Father, in the very same paragraph uses this most significant language in reference to the dethronement of the Pope as temporal ruler of Rome. "The Bible will now be freely circulated, and Beecherism and Fourierism and Bellowism, and all the other *isms* are sure to follow." Have we not here a remarkable confession? First, it connects the overthrow of the Pope with the free circulation of the Bible, which the Priest considers a great calamity. Therefore, if he had the power he would confessedly *proscribe* the free circulation of the Bible. Americans take a note of this! Secondly, it identifies the freedom of such men as Beecher and Bellow and follows to preach and publish their religious views with Pope's loss of power. Hence by necessary inference, the Priest would if he could, use other means than arguments and persuasion to restrain what he deems erroneous religious teaching. He would *proscribe* and prohibit such teachers by arbitrary power. Thirdly, it proclaims the prevalence of all the other *isms*—i.e., the Protestant denominations, Presbyterianism, Methodism &c., as the result of civil liberty in Rome. Therefore, the Priest would like to *proscribe* the liberty of these Protestant Churches. Let any one read the statement in Father F's letter, and he will see there is no escape from these conclusions. And yet he brands the assertion that his church is proscriptive as shown in all history, as "most foul!"

Let the people of America, of Tennessee, of Knoxville, read here in the plain confession of Father Finnegan what they must meet if Roman Catholicism shall gain supreme power in this land—proscription of liberty to teach any form of religion but the Roman—the closing of the blessed volume of Divine Inspiration—the return of mediæval despotism! May God preserve us from that day of darkness, when a church, whose accredited priests can write such language, shall gain dominion over us! To the people of Knoxville I say again, ponder this pregnant sentence of Father Finnegan; and to the good Father himself I say with all good temper—*vale!*

ONE OF VERY MANY.

THE ALABAMA AND CHATTANOOGA RAILROAD.—The statement in our dispatches from New York that the creditors of the A. & C. R. R., have filed a petition to force them into involuntary bankruptcy, was received at noon yesterday. We await with much interest the arrival of the New York papers with full particulars. In the mean time it is proper to state that Maj. T. J. Carlie, Mr. Stanton's purchasing agent and confidential secretary, informed us last night that Mr. Stanton is confident that as soon as the road is completed he can go to New York and settle this trouble, and make arrangements to pay off all his indebtedness. If the road is forced into bankruptcy it will be a terrible blow to Chattanooga, and we earnestly hope that Mr. Stanton may be able to keep his promises.—*Chattanooga Times*.

M. D. Conway, in a letter to the *Independent*, says that the anomalous law making marriage with a deceased wife's sister illegal in England, is due to Henry VIII., and who, in order to establish the legitimacy of his daughter Elizabeth, by Anne Boleyn, had his marriage with Catherine of Aragon thus decreed illegal. The law was practically a dead letter until 1835, when it was revived by a contest over the legitimacy of the Duke of Beaufort, who had married his sister-in-law. A law was then actually passed which legalized this particular marriage, but went on to declare that such marriages, being *contrary to the laws of God*, are illegal! In other words, the laws of God were suspended in favor of an English Duke by order of Parliament!

All the testimony given before the Southern claims commission is taken down verbatim, and comprehensive abstracts of it filled with the cases for the future use and information of the government officers before whom the claims may possibly come. The next public sitting will be on Monday. Nobody but the truly loyal need apply. The abolition of the special taxes on the first of May renders it necessary to reduce the number of internal revenue officers and to consolidate the revenue districts. The commissioner of internal revenue will commence this work on the first of next month.—*Wash. Cor. Bell, Sun*.